

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,894	01/17/2002	Ward Mullins	0036-023	2566
45270 LEV INTELLE	7590 09/12/2007 ECTUAL PROPERTY CON	NSULTING	0036-023 2566 EXAMINER NGUYEN, CAM LINH T ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2161	INER
4766 MICHIG	AN BOULEVARD	NO DI INCO		AM LINH T
YOUNGSTOV	VN, OH 44505	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

				4
*****		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u></u>
Office Action Summary		10/046,894	MULLINS ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		CamLinh Nguyen	2161	
Daviad fa	The MAILING DATE of this communicat		the correspondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repation. The property of the property	ATION. bly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communicatio NDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).	
Status				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed o	n <i>17 July 2007</i>		
	_	☐ This action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice of	allowance except for formal matte	-	s
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>28-37</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>28-37</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Ex	xaminer.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection	- · · ·	, ,	
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	•	· •	d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International see the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in Ap ne priority documents have been re Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage	
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su		
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC r No(s)/Mail Date		/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) -	

Application/Control Number: 10/046,894

Art Unit: 2161

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Response to Amendment

- 1. This Office Action is response to amendment filed on 7/17/2007.
- Applicant's amendments to the claims 1 27 are acknowledged. Consequently, claims 1
 27 have been cancelled. Claims 28 37 have been added, and currently pending for further execution.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 28-37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1 - 17 of copending Application No. 10/382,302; claims 1 - 15 of copending Application No. 10/158,672; claim1 - 14 of copending Application No. 10/386,011; claims 1 - 15 of copending Application No. 11/415,975; claims 1 - 10 of copending Application No. 11/702,939; claims 1 - 10 of copending Application No. 11/702,955. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: transparent persistence data object and complex data object graph model.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,894

Art Unit: 2161

Claim Objections

Page 4

5. Claims 28 - 37 are objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant used

term "API", "CDOG", , "EJB" in the claims but did not clearly define before using them.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 31 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S.

practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are

replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Further, claims 31 did not clearly claim what is

the invention. The Examiner suggests breaking the claim into the preamble, body, so making the

claim more clearly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and

requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2161

9. Claims 34 – 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 34 – 37 are directed to functional descriptive material *per se* and thus be non-statutory for failing to fall within a statutory category. Claim 34 is directed to a module or modules for "creating or maintaining transparent persistence" in the particular system of claim 28. What are the claimed elements of this module or modules???. Therefore, claims 34 – 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21 - 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272 - 4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 - 273 - 8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,894

Art Unit: 2161

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nguyen, Cam-Linh

pyryer Embe h

Art Unit 2161

LN